UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/575,928	03/22/2007	Larry D. Ward	19746	7073
=	7590 06/15/200 TT, MURPHY & PRE	EXAMINER		
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA SUITE 300 GARDEN CITY, NY 11530			HUMPHREY, LOUISE WANG ZHIYING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/575,928	WARD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	LOUISE HUMPHREY	1648				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-62</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1-62</u> are subject to restriction and/or e	election requirement.					
Application Papers	·					
· · · <u> </u>						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	• , ,	, ,	-D 4 4047 IV			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form P	O-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•				

Application/Control Number: 10/575,928 Page 2

Art Unit: 1648

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-62 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claims 1-46, drawn to a method comprising administering to a subject a poxvirus vector encoding a retrovirus antigen and a cytokine, or a functional homolog, derivative, part or analog of the retrovirus antigen and/or the cytokine.

Group II, claims 47-62, drawn to a recombinant poxvirus vector comprising a sequence encoding a retrovirus antigen and a cytokine, or a functional homolog, derivative, part or analog of the retrovirus antigen and/or the cytokine.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The common technical feature among these inventions is a recombinant poxvirus vector encoding a retrovirus antigen and a cytokine. Such a product is rendered obvious by the combination of Belyakov *et al.* (April 1999) and Radaelli *et al.* (20 July 2003). Radaelli *et al.* discloses a method of administering a recombinant fowlpox encoding SIV *gag* and *pol* genes. Belyakov *et al.* discloses that HIV antigen-specific CTL response by mucosal treatment with a recombinant vaccinia virus expressing HIV envelope protein can be enhanced by co-administering recombinant mouse IL-12 in mice with preexisting immunity to poxvirus. Therefore, the technical feature is not a contribution over the art, thus, the claimed invention cannot be said to have unity of invention.

Restriction to Single Sequence Election

Note that this is <u>not a species election</u> and is <u>separate from a group election</u>.

Claims 18, 19, 23, 24, 27, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 58, 59 and 62 specifically claim multiple nucleic acid sequences, which are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §121. Each such sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121 and 37 CFR 1.141 *et seq* (See MPEP §803.04). Each sequence is not considered to be a proper member of a Markush group. See M.P.E.P. § 803.02. *In re Hamish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility. As such, sequences in each of claims 18, 19, 23, 24, 27, 34, 35, 39, 40, 43, 53, 54, 58, 59 and 62 are not considered to constitute a proper genus/Markush, and are therefore subject to additional restriction.

Furthermore, a search of more than one (1) of the sequences present in these claims presents an undue burden on the Patent and Trademark Office due to the complex nature of the search in terms of computer time needed to perform the search and the subsequent analysis of the search results by the examiner. Each of the SEQ ID NO's is a unique and separately patentable sequence, requiring a non-coextensive search for the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, one (1) sequence is considered to be a reasonable number of sequences for examination. Accordingly, applicants must further elect ONE

SEQ ID NO. for the claimed vector, or alternatively, elect one SEQ ID NO. for the retrovirus antigen in combination with one SEQ ID NO. for the cytokine, which if determined to be patentable, would also be patentably distinct from other sequences. Failure to elect a specific sequence will be considered to be non-responsive reply.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are

subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOUISE HUMPHREY whose telephone number is

Application/Control Number: 10/575,928 Page 6

Art Unit: 1648

(571)272-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu, 9:00 am - 5:30

pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on 571-272-0832. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/L. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 1648

10 June 2009

/Larry R. Helms/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1643